DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 619 SP 018 875

AUTHOR Smith, Douglas J.
TITLE A State Funding Model for In-Service Training of School Staff.
PUB DATE Aug 81
NOTE 12p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Educational Legislation; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Implementation; *School District Autonomy; School Districts; Schools of Education; Staff Development; *State Aid
IDENTIFIERS *Michigan

ABSTRACT

In 1979 the Michigan State legislature allocated $3.2 million for kindergarten through twelfth grade school staff development programs (Public Act 94, Article 9, Section 97). The emphasis in the legislation was to establish a competitive market for the purchase and utilization of resources to identify needs and provide skill development for school employees. In order to receive the funds, each school district was required to submit a needs assessment, designate the responsible agents, and identify the goals, progress, and evaluation mechanism of the program. It was also mandated that: (1) all administrators would be included in inservice and management training; (2) inservice training programs would be attended on a voluntary basis; and (3) staff development would be primarily noncredit. Incentives in the legislation encouraged cooperative planning between school districts and schools of education through the provision of matching funds. The legislation was intended to give maximum autonomy for the school districts while allowing funds for nonsalary items. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206619

A STATE FUNDING MODEL FOR IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF SCHOOL STAFF

Douglas J. Smith
Special Assistant to the Governor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DOUGLAS J. SMITH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

August, 198

SP018875

A STATE FUNDING MODEL FOR IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF SCHOOL STAFF

Douglas J. Smith
Special Assistant to the Governor

All the educational jargon and theory stops at the classroom--the teacher, the curriculum materials, and the student. There is empirical evidence to show that time spent on direct instruction and the quality of materials have a direct affect on student achievement. Yet our attention, resources, and rhetoric have often gone far afield.

In the interest of tackling the issue of teacher preparation and continuing education, the Governor proposed a new funding model for professional development for school employees (1979 State of the State Message). Legislation finally adopted by the Michigan Legislature (Public Act 94 of 1979, Section 97) established a vehicle for people key in influencing schools, particularly teachers, to determine in a shared decision-making process what is professionally needed to improve the interaction with students.

The legislation allocated $3.2 million for K-12 districts for staff development programs. Each district is eligible for $25 per professional staff. Districts or consortiums with 750 staff persons are eligible for an additional $10 per staff person.

Each district was required to submit a needs assessment; identification of goals and progress of the program; an evaluation mechanism; and designation of a coordinator, policy board, and fiscal agent. Further, the legislation listed the state's priorities for professional development as equal educational opportunity, management training, utilization of assessment data, and special needs children.

Administration was limited to 15 percent of the money, and expenditures for facilities or stipend payments were prohibited.

The state's entrance into directly funding staff development for all school employees, and most specifically teachers, is foremost a recognition by the state of the critical nature of such training to the entire educational process.

Much of the in-service contained in funds for special constituency and special interest programs has missed the mark. The focus has been on program improvement and often only secondary importance given to the people trained to make a program work. (This statement does not intend to indicate that there is no need for programs such as bilingual and special education, etc.) Despite all the monies and attention devoted to bilingual education programs, there has been minimal attention to teacher training, quality textbooks, and innovative ways to accredit a classroom allowing a trained teacher and a bilingual aide to operate a classroom.

Further, a problem that was at the root of related court cases has been greatly ignored. Bilingual instruction was mandated because students with primary languages other than English experienced difficulty in communicating and participating in English-speaking classrooms. It was mandated because teachers and administrators could not identify linguistic-based learning deficiencies and problems and then develop educational programs to match the students' needs.

The key, the ability of teachers to identify the source of learning problems--linguistic, emotional or psychological--is the root problem. This is a generic skill necessary for <u>all</u> teachers in <u>all</u> programs. Yet, little attention and resources from categorical programs have been redirected at the classroom teacher to enhance essential teaching and diagnostic skills.

The emphasis on training adminstrators and teachers to deal with the problems which face teachers in the classrooms in the 1980s rests on the

assumption that schools, through the collaboration of administrators and teachers, can make a difference in children's attitudinal skill development and knowledge acquisition.

The emphasis in this program is to establish a competitive market for the purchase and utilization of resources to identify the needs and provide the upgrading of skills for school employees. State dollars are aimed at non-salary items, the purchase of services of the instructors (and it may well be active classroom teachers), materials, etc. The professional staff development program is free to purchase the resources from any group or organization meeting the employees' needs. It may be managerial skills from private industry personnel, improved artistic appreciation from a private school instructor, or a proven method of mathematics instruction from a business program in higher education.

Another issue in staff development addressed in the funding mechanism is that while local schools should have freedom over curriculum, materials, and course content, the state does have a definite interest in encouraging certain types of in-service consistent with state priorities. In the 1980s and beyond, the state's interests include: environmental and energy-related subjects, multicultural and nonsexist education, use of assessment data, CPR training, art education, and nutrition. The state can, as in the case of Michigan's new law, list the state's multiple objectives/priorities for local districts; the final decision still remains at the local level.

At no time is it to be assumed that these are the only dollars to be dedicated to in-service training. The mechanism contains financial incentives to establish consortia of local school districts to work together. These incentives recognize that each district has its own operational methods and patterns of advancement which may benefit by the inclusion of

in-service training and contact with other districts of varying sizes and with other priorities. This incentive attempts to utilize resources of other teachers at the local and intermediate school district levels. This pooling of resources needs to be balanced with each school district targeting in-service activities at the building level.

It was necessary to begin by targeting state dollars for in-service instructional training with some requirements:

1. All administrators should be part of the teacher in-service as well as the target of management training.

2. Instructional in-service training needs to be on a voluntary basis.

   This will require an agreement among treachers and administrators about what the nature of the in-service training will be. It will require the programs to be attended based on the merit of the program, not on fulfilling some arbitrary requirement or even direct financial gain. Teacher stipends may be a part of staff development, pay for substitute teachers in certain circumstances needs to be considered, and there is a necessity to recognize in the overall reimbursement of teachers the full set of time requirements necessary for in-service; but these payments should be a local responsibility and not funded from this categorical. The state's money in this categorical is to establish incentives for purchasing high-quality staff development materials and teachers through a competitive search.

3. Staff development primarily should be on a noncredit basis.

   The programming developed by higher education shall be structured by local staff needs not degree program and credit hour designed for graduating students. The state needs to recognize that higher education institutional goals are more than just the graduation of students.

4. Funds are needed for the purchase of human resources (teachers from other districts, intermediate school districts, colleges, etc.), curriculum materials to teach teachers or materials to be used in the classroom, and for a facilitator or program coordinator.

The task of improving in-service instructional training will not be easy. For too long, in-service training simply has been an extra day to either catch up on paperwork or spend cleaning the classroom. The "teacher-centers" approach and attempts at in-service training have been plagued with two major problems: duplication and under-utilization of resources of the schools of education and the need for continuity and followup in-service instruction.

In recognizing that existing resources should be fully utilized, incentives are needed to utilize teachers from all levels in developing in-service training programs.

Unfortunately, the major factor for generating dollars in higher education in Michigan has been degree-granting and credit-producing courses and programs. This often makes the quality, the necessity, and the relevance of the courses for in-service training geared to acquiring degrees in the long run and credits in the short run rather than the needs of the local school districts' teachers. Until recently, most institutions of higher education and their schools of education simply did not perceive one of their responsibilities to be to provide in-service training for K-12 staff. (The state is partly responsible.)

The establishment of separate buildings--separate facilities--outside the existing school building causes the concern that we are simply duplicating resources already available in the schools of education (or more generally in higher education institutions) and for which we, in Michigan, are spending nearly $40 million annually.

The systems of preservice education and in-service training are not synonymous, different methods and goals are applicable; but neither are those programs mutually exclusive.

Perhaps the most grave problem plaguing the traditional in-service approach is noted by administrators and teachers alike who have sought to develop quality programs for in-service training. These educators recognize that for in-service training to actually work requires a system integral to the school building and classroom, having continuity, and involving teachers and administrators at all times in the planning and delivery of programs.

What I suggest is that someday both administrative and teaching obligations will no longer be perceived by the public as solely 180 days or 900 hours of instruction, but also will include an in-service training component. (This already is reflected in many contracts statewide.)

Incentives for involving higher education are necessary. The schools of education must be given a chance to work with local schools to restructure their own teacher education programs and to have the freedom to work directly with classroom teachers without always structuring a credit-hour for graduation purposes. This is no small task.

Unfortunately, the universities and colleges, particularly the schools of education, no longer enjoy the luxury of having the confidence of citizens, legislators, or teachers that they have programs relevant to teaching in the classroom. The schools of education should see the new funding mechanism as an opportunity to earn their way back into the leadership of teacher training. A reflection of this lack of credibility is the federal and state attempts to establish other major centers for in-service training programs not centered in the schools of education.

Once the local schools have the funds for staff development, the state needs to carefully watch where local schools turn to acquire the services. If, in fact, the schools use programs developed in higher education because

they have the resources or are willing to restructure and retool the skills of the faculty, then the state might provide additional funding for staff development to higher education.

The second part of the funding model to match the $3.2 million to local schools is to provide a pool of dollars colleges and universities can draw from to supplement contracts developed with local schools. The system of financing higher education could allow for one-third of a contract to be generated by the institution. As an example, Michigan State University would establish a contract with the Lansing School District to provide $90,000 for teacher training in the areas of multicultural education and classroom management skills. The school district would provide $60,000 from its resources to purchase the services, and the institution would generate an additional $30,000 from the state to complete the contract.

This method of financing addresses several goals:

1. It places the final decision of needs assessment and who will provide service in the hands of the practitioner district and its policy board, not the higher education institution.
2. It does recognize that a legitimate function of higher education is providing in-service training by directly funding it.
3. It recognizes that while the schools of education may be an appropriate focus for universities' and colleges' work with local schools, the entire university has resources that should be called upon from business and engineering programs to psychology and economics. By allowing the institutions to generate funds, it sets in motion institutionwide decisions on how to deploy resources to meet a function of these institutions, not just the school of education.
4. It encourages schools to look at higher education programs because their dollars will stretch farther. If they buy from industry,

they get a dollar-for-dollar bargain. But if higher education can deliver the assistance, they can supplement the local dollars with institutional dollars.

The most critical issue in education today is how to provide good-quality, in-service, instructional training to the school staff. This must begin with the involvement of teachers in defining in-service needs and then retraining and redirecting administrators and higher education to provide the in-service programs. This means improving administrators' capabilities to provide supportive materials, instruction, and curriculum leadership.

The end result of the state's efforts should be to make teacher preparation a rigorous course of study that requires some introspection of self goals and capabilities as well as a mastery of learning theory and the history of children's emotional, mental, and physical growth patterns. The end result should be to make teaching not just rewarding when students return years later to praise their teachers with their deeds and words, but to make teaching challenging on a day-to-day basis by providing the teacher with stimulating curriculum of continuing educational opportunities. Someday, the time teachers spend in in-service education should be recognized by all as being as valuable and as important as teachers' time with students.

Excerpt from House Bill 4245
Public Act 94 of 1979, State of Michigan

Article 9, Section 97

Sec. 97. (1) From the amount appropriated in section 11, there is allocated not to exceed, $3,200,000.00 to applicant districts and intermedicate districts for local professional staff development and career education in-service programs. Each district and intermedicate district shall be eligible to receive $25.00 per professional staff member. Each district or intermediate district with a professional staff equal to or greater than 750, or a consortium of districts, intermedicate districts, or a combination of districts and intermediate districts with professional staff of 750 or more shall be eligible for an additional $10.00 per professional staff member upon completion of an application as approved by the department to be submitted by December 15, 1979.

(2) Applications submitted for receipt of funds under this section shall include:

(a) Identification of the district, intermedicate district, or consortium needs assessment for staff development by the local policy board.

(b) Identification of the goals and objectives of a staff development program by the local policy board.

(c) Identification of the process for program development and identification of potential resources such as colleges, universities, community colleges, and intermediate districts.

(d) Identification of the process for program evaluation.

(e) Designation of a program coordinator.

(f) Designation of a policy board with a minimum of 11 members. The teacher representatives shall be appointed by the teachers' collective bargaining agent or elected by all teachers in an area where there is not a collective bargaining agent. The policy board shall consist of a majority of teachers with the balance of the board composed of representatives of district or intermediate district boards of education, administrators, and other support personnel.

(g) Designation of a legal fiscal agent.

(h) Provision for the in-service of teachers and counselors on career education.

(3) Participation by professional staff may be voluntary.

(4) A 3-year plan shall be submitted which prioritizes utilization of staff development funds. This plan may include locally identified needs in the following areas:

(a) Equal educational opportunity, including title IX of the education amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-318, 86 Stat. 235; title VI of the civil rights act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, 78 Stat. 241; and section 504 of the rehabilitation act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. 794.

(b) Management training for administrators.

(c) Utilization of assessment results for district and building level improvement in the basic skills.

(d) Working with pupils with special needs including work in bilingual programs, mainstreaming programs, and academically talented pupils programs.

(5) Not more than 15% of the money received may be used for program coordination without department approval.

(6) The funds allocated under this section shall not be expended for facility rental, overhead charges, or stipend payments.

(7) A legal fiscal agent may be a district or an intermediate district.

(8) The department shall submit a progress report on all professional development activities to the legislature not later than April 1 each year.

(9) From the amount allocated in subsection (1), the department shall allocate $5.10 per professional staff member to applicant districts and intermedicate districts for the purpose of conducting career education professional development programs, as defined by the department. The career education professional development activities shall correspond to the professional development needs identified in the district or intermediate district career education plan for the current year. The career education in-service plan of each professional development program shall be approved by the career education planning district council representing the districts and intermediate districts involved. Programs and personnel funded under section 61 and 96 shall not be funded under this subsection.

(10) Additional general fund revenue which becomes available for districts or intermedicate districts for local professional staff development and career education in-service programs, is appropriated for that purpose. An amount equal to the additional general fund revenue which becomes available for districts or intermediate districts for local professional staff development and career education in-service programs shall be deducted from the amount appropriated in section 11 as allocated pursuant to subsection (1) and shall be credited to the general fund of the state.